

## Pileup subtraction for jet shapes

Gregory Soyez<sup>1</sup>, Gavin P. Salam<sup>2,3,4</sup>, Jihun Kim<sup>1</sup>, Souvik Dutta<sup>5</sup> and Matteo Cacciari<sup>3,6</sup><sup>1</sup>*IPhT, CEA Saclay, CNRS URA 2306, F-91191 Gif-sur-Yvette, France*<sup>2</sup>*CERN, PH-TH, CH-1211 Geneva 23, Switzerland*<sup>3</sup>*LPTHE; CNRS UMR 7589; UPMC Univ. Paris 6; Paris 75252, France*<sup>4</sup>*Department of Physics, Princeton University, Princeton, NJ 08544, USA*<sup>5</sup>*IIT Bombay, Mumbai, MH 400076, India*<sup>6</sup>*Université Paris Diderot, Paris, France*

Jet shapes have the potential to play a role in many LHC analyses, for example in quark-gluon discrimination or jet substructure analyses for hadronic decays of boosted heavy objects. Most shapes, however, are significantly affected by pileup. We introduce a general method to correct for pileup effects in shapes, which acts event-by-event and jet-by-jet, and accounts also for hadron masses. It involves a numerical determination, for each jet, of a given shape’s susceptibility to pileup. Together with existing techniques for determining the level of pileup, this then enables an extrapolation to zero pileup. The method can be used for a wide range of jet shapes and we show its successful application in the context of quark/gluon discrimination and top-tagging.

When energetic quarks or gluons (partons) fragment, they produce collimated bunches of hadrons known as jets. Jets mostly conserve the energy and direction of the originating parton, consequently they have long been used at colliders as a stand-in for generic partons, as is the case currently at CERN’s Large Hadron Collider (LHC). In recent years extensive interest has developed in going beyond this basic use: for example, to understand if the parton is a quark or a gluon, or to identify rare cases where a single jet originated from multiple hard partons, perhaps from the hadronic decay of a highly-boosted W, Z or Higgs boson, top quark or other massive object [1–3]. The “jet substructure” techniques being developed in this context will be crucial to exploit the full kinematic reach of the LHC, notably the high transverse-momentum (high- $p_t$ ) region, and to maximise the LHC’s sensitivity to hadronic manifestations of new physics scenarios.

Two key classes of approach are available to probe substructure: one identifies smaller “subjets” within a larger jet and then perform selections based on the kinematics of those subjets, for example [4–10]; the other involves jet-shape observables, sensitive to the geometrical spread of the energy within the jet, e.g. [11–18]. Both classes appear to be powerful and viable experimentally (see e.g. [19, 20]) and ultimate performance in exploiting jet substructure will probably be obtained through some combination of them.

One potential show-stopper in substructure studies is the problem of pileup: with the LHC now operating at high instantaneous luminosities, each interesting, high- $p_t$  proton-proton collision is accompanied by dozens of additional  $pp$  collisions, which add substantial low- $p_t$  noise to the event. Pileup modifies a jet’s kinematics, on average shifting its  $p_t$  in proportion to the level of noise in the event and to the jet’s extent, or “area” [21], in rapidity ( $y = \frac{1}{2} \ln \frac{E+p_z}{E-p_z}$ ) and azimuth ( $\phi$ ). Two techniques are in common use to correct for this: the removal of an “offset” from the jet in proportion to the number

of observed pileup events [22]; and the “area–median” method, which subtracts an amount given by the product of the event’s measured pileup  $p_t$  density ( $\rho$ ) and the jet’s measured area ( $A$ ) [23–25].<sup>1</sup> While the second of these methods can be straightforwardly applied also to subjets, jet shapes have so far proved more challenging to correct.

Jet shapes are particularly sensitive to pileup because its diffuse soft energy flow is characteristically different from the more collimated distribution of energy due to normal jet fragmentation. One can attempt to mitigate pileup’s impact by determining the shape using just charged tracks, or by breaking a jet into subjets and using just the hardest subjets; but both methods throw away a significant fraction of the original particles contributing to the jet’s shape, introducing a bias. One can also carry out analytical calculations of a given shape’s sensitivity, as in Refs. [27, 28], or add in particles from a “complementary” cone at 90 degrees to the jet’s axis in order to determine an average sensitivity [28]. These methods have so far, however, been limited either to specific observables, restricted classes of jets (e.g. circular jets), or low pileup. The intent of this letter is to develop an effective, simple, general method to correct jet shapes for pileup.

Our approach is related to the area–median method, which has been found to be beneficial in both ATLAS [24] and CMS [25] (see also [29]). It is intended to be valid for arbitrary jet algorithms and generic infrared and collinear safe jet shapes,<sup>2</sup> without the need for dedicated

<sup>1</sup> With particle flow [26], one can also directly discard the charged component of pileup [25]. The remaining neutral part must be subtracted in some other way (it may not be the expected fraction of the charged component, due to detector effects).

<sup>2</sup> For the correction of collinear unsafe quantities, e.g. fragmentation function moments, as used for quark/gluon discrimination in [30], see [31].

analytic study of each individual shape variable. It also involves an extension of the original area–median prescription to account for hadron masses.

The first ingredient is a characterisation of the average pileup density in a given event in terms of two variables,  $\rho$  and  $\rho_m$ , such that the 4-vector of the expected pileup deposition in a small region of size  $\delta y \delta \phi$  can be written

$$[\rho \cos \phi, \rho \sin \phi, (\rho + \rho_m) \sinh y, (\rho + \rho_m) \cosh y] \delta y \delta \phi, \quad (1)$$

where  $\rho$  and  $\rho_m$  have only weak dependence on  $y$  (and  $\phi$ ). Relative to the original area–median proposal [23], a novelty here is the inclusion of a term  $\rho_m$ . It arises because pileup consists of low- $p_t$  hadrons, and their masses are not negligible relative to their  $p_t$  (cf. also [32, 33]). It is important mainly for observables sensitive to differences between energy and 3-momentum, e.g. jet masses, as we will see below.

The second and main new ingredient is a determination, for a specific jet, of the shape’s sensitivity to pileup. Let the shape be defined by some function  $V(\{p_i\}_{\text{jet}})$  of the momenta  $p_i$  in the jet. Among these momenta, we include a set of “ghosts” [21], very low momentum particles that cover the  $y - \phi$  plane at high density, each of them mimicking a pileup-like component in a region of area  $A_g$ . We then consider the derivatives of the jet shape with respect to the transverse momentum scale,  $p_{t,g}$ , of the ghosts and with respect to a component  $m_{\delta,g} \equiv \sqrt{m_g^2 + p_{t,g}^2} - p_{t,g}$ ,

$$V_{\text{jet}}^{(n,m)} \equiv A_g^{n+m} \partial_{p_{t,g}}^n \partial_{m_{\delta,g}}^m V(\{p_i\}_{\text{jet}}). \quad (2)$$

The derivatives are to be evaluated at  $p_{t,g} = m_{\delta,g} = 0$ , and by scaling all ghost momenta simultaneously.

Given the level of pileup,  $\rho, \rho_m$ , and the information on the derivatives, one can then extrapolate the value of the jet’s shape to zero pileup,

$$V_{\text{jet,sub}} = V_{\text{jet}} - \rho V_{\text{jet}}^{(1,0)} - \rho_m V_{\text{jet}}^{(0,1)} + \frac{1}{2} \rho^2 V_{\text{jet}}^{(2,0)} + \frac{1}{2} \rho_m^2 V_{\text{jet}}^{(0,2)} + \rho \rho_m V_{\text{jet}}^{(1,1)} + \dots \quad (3)$$

where the formula takes into account the fact that the derivatives are evaluated for the jet including the pileup.

Handling derivatives with respect to both  $p_{t,g}$  and  $m_{\delta,g}$  can be cumbersome in practice. An alternative is to introduce a new variable  $r_{t,g}$  and set  $p_{t,g} = r_{t,g}$  and  $m_{\delta,g} = \frac{\rho_m}{\rho} r_{t,g}$ . We then take total derivatives with respect to  $r_{t,g}$

$$V_{\text{jet}}^{[n]} \equiv A_g^n \frac{d^n}{dr_{t,g}^n} V(\{p_i\}_{\text{jet}}), \quad (4)$$

so that the correction can be rewritten

$$V_{\text{jet,sub}} = V_{\text{jet}} - \rho V_{\text{jet}}^{[1]} + \frac{1}{2} \rho^2 V_{\text{jet}}^{[2]} + \dots \quad (5)$$

The derivatives  $V^{(m,n)}$  or  $V_{\text{jet}}^{[n]}$  can be determined numerically, for a specific jet, by rescaling the ghost

momenta and reevaluating the jet shape for multiple rescaled values. Typically this is more stable with Eq. (4) and this is the approach we use below.

To investigate the performance of our correction procedure, we consider a number of jet shapes:

- Angularities [12, 34], adapted to hadron-collider jets as  $\theta^{(\beta)} = \sum_i p_{ti} \Delta R_{i,\text{jet}}^\beta / \sum_i p_{ti}$ , for  $\beta = 0.5, 1, 2, 3$ ;  $\theta^{(1)}$ , the “girth”, “width” or “broadening” of the jet, has been found to be particularly useful for quark/gluon discrimination [17, 35].
- Energy-energy-correlation (EEC) moments, advocated for their resummation simplicity in [36],  $E^{(\beta)} = \sum_{i,j} p_{ti} p_{tj} \Delta R_{i,j}^\beta / (\sum_i p_{ti})^2$ , using the same set of  $\beta$  values. EEC-related variables have been studied recently also in [37].
- “Subjettiness” ratios, designed for characterising multi-pronged jets [13–15]: one defines the subjettiness  $\tau_N^{(\text{axes},\beta)} = \sum_i p_{ti} \min(\Delta R_{i1}, \dots, \Delta R_{iN})^\beta / \sum_i p_{ti}$ , where  $\Delta R_{ia}$  is the distance between particle  $i$  and axis  $a$ , where  $a$  runs from 1 to  $N$ . One typically considers ratios such as  $\tau_{21} \equiv \tau_2/\tau_1$  and  $\tau_{32} \equiv \tau_3/\tau_2$  (the latter used e.g. in a recent search for R-parity violating gluino decays [38]); we consider  $\beta = 1$  and  $\beta = 2$ , as well as two choices for determining the axes: “kt”, which exploits the  $k_t$  algorithm [39, 40] to decluster the jet to  $N$  subjets and then uses their axes; and “1kt”, which adjusts the “kt” axes so as to obtain a single-pass approximate minimisation of  $\tau_N$  [15].
- A longitudinally invariant version of the planar flow [11, 12], involving a  $2 \times 2$  matrix  $M_{\alpha\beta} = \sum_i p_{ti} (\alpha_i - \alpha_{\text{jet}}) (\beta_i - \beta_{\text{jet}})$ , where  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$  correspond either to the rapidity  $y$  or azimuth  $\phi$ ; the planar flow is then given by  $\text{Pf} = 4\lambda_1 \lambda_2 / (\lambda_1 + \lambda_2)^2$ , where  $\lambda_{1,2}$  are the two eigenvalues of the matrix.

One should be aware that observables constructed from ratios of shapes, such as  $\tau_{n,n-1}$  and planar flow, are not infrared and collinear (IRC) safe for generic jets. In particular  $\text{Pf}$  and  $\tau_{21}$  are IRC safe only when applied to jets with a structure of at least two hard prongs, usually guaranteed by requiring the jets to have significant mass;  $\tau_{32}$  requires a hard three-pronged structure,<sup>3</sup> a condition not imposed in previous work, and that we will apply here through a cut on  $\tau_{21}$ .

<sup>3</sup> Consider a jet consisting instead of just two hard particles with  $p_t = 1000$  GeV, with  $\phi = 0, 0.5$  and two further soft particles with  $p_t = \epsilon$ , at  $\phi = 0.05, 0.1$ , all particles having  $y = 0$ . It is straightforward to see that  $\tau_{32}$  is finite and independent of  $\epsilon$  for  $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$ , which results in an infinite leading-order perturbative distribution for  $\tau_{32}$ .




FIG. 1: Impact of pileup and subtraction on various jet-shape distributions and their averages, in dijet,  $WW$  and  $t\bar{t}$  production processes. The distributions are shown for Poisson distributed pileup (with an average of 30 pileup events) and the averages are shown as a function of the number of pileup events,  $n_{\text{PU}}$ . The shapes are calculated for jets with  $p_t > 500$  GeV (the cut is applied before adding pileup, as are the cuts on the jet mass  $m_J$  and subjettness ratio  $\tau_{21}$  where relevant).

For the angularities and EEC moments we have verified that the first two numerically-obtained derivatives agree with analytical calculations in the case of a jet consisting of a single hard particle. For variables like  $\tau_N$  that involve a partition of a jet, one subtlety is that the partitioning can change as the ghost momenta are varied to evaluate the numerical derivative. The resulting discontinuities (or non-smoothness) in the observable's value would then result in nonsensical estimates of the derivatives. We find no such issue in our numerical method to evaluate the derivatives, but were it to arise, one could choose to force a fixed partitioning.

To test the method in simulated events with pileup, we use Pythia 8.165, tune 4C [41, 42]. We consider 3 hard event samples: dijet,  $WW$  and  $t\bar{t}$  production, with hadronic  $W$  decays, all with underlying event (UE) turned off (were it turned on, the subtraction procedure would remove it too). We use anti- $k_t$  jets [43] with  $R = 0.7$ , taking only those with  $p_t > 500$  GeV (before addition of pileup). All jet-finding is performed with FastJet 3.0 [44]. The determination of  $\rho$  and  $\rho_m$

for each event follows the area-median approach [23]: the event is broken into patches and in each patch one evaluates  $p_{t,\text{patch}} = \sum_{i \in \text{patch}} p_{t,i}$ , as well as  $m_{\delta,\text{patch}} = \sum_{i \in \text{patch}} (\sqrt{m_i^2 + p_{t,i}^2} - p_{t,i})$ , where the sum runs over particles  $i$  in the patch. Then  $\rho$  and  $\rho_m$  are given by

$$\rho = \text{median}_{\text{patches}} \left\{ \frac{p_{t,\text{patch}}}{A_{\text{patch}}} \right\}, \quad \rho_m = \text{median}_{\text{patches}} \left\{ \frac{m_{\delta,\text{patch}}}{A_{\text{patch}}} \right\}, \quad (6)$$

where  $A$  is the area of each patch. To obtain the patches we cluster the event with the  $k_t$  algorithm with  $R = 0.4$ . For non-zero  $\rho_m$  the formula for correcting a jet's 4-momentum is

$$p_{\text{jet,sub}}^\mu = p_{\text{jet}}^\mu - [\rho A_{\text{jet}}^x, \rho A_{\text{jet}}^y, (\rho + \rho_m) A_{\text{jet}}^z, (\rho + \rho_m) A_{\text{jet}}^E], \quad (7)$$

with the area 4-vector,  $A^\mu$ , as defined in [21].

We have 17 observables and 3 event samples. Fig. 1 gives a representative subset of the resulting 51 distributions, showing in each case the distribution (and average) for the shape without pileup (solid green line), the result




FIG. 2: Left: rate for tagging quark and gluon jets using a fixed cut on the jet width, shown as a function of the number of pileup vertices. Middle: filtered jet-mass distribution for fat jets in  $t\bar{t}$  events, showing the impact of the  $\rho$  and  $\rho_m$  components of the subtraction. Right: tagging rate of an  $N$ -subjettiness top tagger for  $t\bar{t}$  signal and dijet background as a function of the number of pileup vertices. All cuts are applied after addition (and possible subtraction) of pileup. Subtraction acts on  $\tau_1$ ,  $\tau_2$  and  $\tau_3$  individually. See text for further details.

with pileup (dashed line) and the impact of subtracting first and second derivatives (dotted and solid black lines respectively). The plots for the distributions have been generated using a Poisson distribution of pileup events with an average of 30 events (our count includes diffractive and elastic events, and the analysis uses all particles from the event generator, leading to  $\rho \simeq 770$  MeV and  $\rho_m \simeq 125$  MeV per pileup event at central rapidities).

For nearly all the jet shapes, the pileup has a substantial impact, shifting the average values by up to 50–100% (as compared to a 5–10% effect on the jet  $p_t$ ). The subtraction performs adequately: the averaged subtracted results for the shapes usually return very close to their original values, with the second derivative playing a small but sometimes relevant role. For the distributions, tails of the distributions are generally well recovered; however intrajet pileup fluctuations cause sharp peaks to be somewhat broadened. These cannot be corrected for without applying some form of noise reduction, which would however also tend to introduce a bias. Of the 51 combinations of observable and process that we examined, most were of similar quality to those illustrated in Fig. 1, with the broadening of narrow peaks found to be more extreme for larger  $\beta$  values. The one case where the subtraction procedure failed was the planar flow for (hadronic)  $WW$  events: here the impact of pileup is dramatic, transforming a peak near the lower boundary of the shape’s range,  $P_f = 0$ , into a peak near its upper boundary,  $P_f = 1$  (bottom-right plot of Fig. 1). This is an example where one cannot view the pileup as simply “perturbing” the jet shape, in part because of intrinsic large non-linearities in the shape’s behaviour; with our particular set of  $p_t$  cuts and jet definition, the use of the small- $\rho$  expansion of Eq. (5) fails to adequately correct the planar flow for more than about 15 pileup events.

Next, we consider the use of the subtraction approach in the context of quark/gluon discrimination. In a study

of a large number of shapes, Ref. [17] found the jet girth or broadening,  $\theta^{(1)}$ , to be the most effective single infrared and collinear safe quark/gluon discriminator. Fig. 2 (left) shows the fraction of quark and gluon-induced jets that pass a fixed cut on  $\theta^{(1)} \leq 0.05$  as a function of the level of pileup — pileup radically changes the impact of the cut, while after subtraction the q/g discrimination returns to its original behaviour.

Our last test involves top tagging, which we illustrate on  $R = 1$ , anti- $k_t$  jets using cuts on the “filtered” jet mass and on the  $\tau_{32}$  subjettiness ratio. The filtering selects the 4 hardest  $R_{\text{filt}} = 0.25$ , Cambridge/Aachen [45] subjets after pileup subtraction. The distribution of filtered jet mass is shown in Fig. 2 (middle), illustrating that the subtraction mostly recovers the original distribution and that  $\rho_m$  is as important as  $\rho$  (specific treatments of hadron masses, e.g. setting them to zero, may limit the impact of  $\rho_m$  in an experimental context). The tagger itself consists of cuts on  $\tau_{32} < 0.6$ ,  $\tau_{21} \geq 0.15$  and a requirement that the filtered [6] jet mass be between 150 and 200 GeV. The rightmost plot of Fig. 2 shows the final tagging efficiencies for hadronic top quarks and for generic dijets as a function of the number of pileup events. Pileup has a huge impact on the tagging, but most of the original performance is restored after subtraction.

To conclude, this letter has shown how most jet shapes can be straightforwardly corrected for the effects of pileup. The corrections allow shape-based jet substructure analyses to continue to perform well even in the presence of up to 60 pileup events, notably when combined with the corrections introduced here for hadron masses in pileup. This progress will help ensure the viability of a broad range of jet substructure tools, shape-based and subset-based, in high-luminosity LHC running.

The software for the general shape subtraction approach presented here will be made available as part of the FastJet Contrib project [46].

## Acknowledgments

We are grateful to David Miller and Jesse Thaler for helpful conversations. This work was supported by

the French Agence Nationale de la Recherche, under grants ANR-09-BLAN-0060 and ANR-10-CEXC-009-01 and by the EU ITN grant LHCPHenoNet, PITN-GA-2010-264564.

- 
- [1] A. Abdesselam, E. B. Kuutmann, U. Bitenc, G. Brooijmans, J. Butterworth, P. Bruckman de Renstrom, D. Buarque Franzosi and R. Buckingham *et al.*, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **71** (2011) 1661 [arXiv:1012.5412 [hep-ph]].
- [2] A. Altheimer, S. Arora, L. Asquith, G. Brooijmans, J. Butterworth, M. Campanelli, B. Chapleau and A. E. Cholakian *et al.*, *J. Phys. G* **39** (2012) 063001 [arXiv:1201.0008 [hep-ph]].
- [3] T. Plehn and M. Spannowsky, *J. Phys. G* **39** (2012) 083001 [arXiv:1112.4441 [hep-ph]].
- [4] M. H. Seymour, *Z. Phys. C* **62** (1994) 127.
- [5] J. M. Butterworth, B. E. Cox and J. R. Forshaw, *Phys. Rev. D* **65** (2002) 096014 [arXiv:hep-ph/0201098].
- [6] J. M. Butterworth, A. R. Davison, M. Rubin and G. P. Salam, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **100** (2008) 242001 [arXiv:0802.2470 [hep-ph]].
- [7] D. E. Kaplan, K. Rehermann, M. D. Schwartz and B. Tweedie, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **101** (2008) 142001 [arXiv:0806.0848 [hep-ph]].
- [8] S. D. Ellis, C. K. Vermilion and J. R. Walsh, arXiv:0912.0033 [hep-ph].
- [9] D. Krohn, J. Thaler and L. -T. Wang, *JHEP* **1002** (2010) 084 [arXiv:0912.1342 [hep-ph]].
- [10] T. Plehn, G. P. Salam and M. Spannowsky, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **104** (2010) 111801 [arXiv:0910.5472 [hep-ph]]. T. Plehn, M. Spannowsky, M. Takeuchi and D. Zerwas, *JHEP* **1010** (2010) 078 [arXiv:1006.2833 [hep-ph]].
- [11] J. Thaler and L. -T. Wang, *JHEP* **0807** (2008) 092 [arXiv:0806.0023 [hep-ph]].
- [12] L. G. Almeida, S. J. Lee, G. Perez, G. F. Sterman, I. Sung and J. Virzi, *Phys. Rev. D* **79** (2009) 074017 [arXiv:0807.0234 [hep-ph]].
- [13] J. -H. Kim, *Phys. Rev. D* **83** (2011) 011502 [arXiv:1011.1493 [hep-ph]].
- [14] J. Thaler and K. Van Tilburg, *JHEP* **1103** (2011) 015 [arXiv:1011.2268 [hep-ph]].
- [15] J. Thaler and K. Van Tilburg, *JHEP* **1202** (2012) 093 [arXiv:1108.2701 [hep-ph]].
- [16] A. Hook, M. Jankowiak and J. G. Wacker, *JHEP* **1204** (2012) 007 [arXiv:1102.1012 [hep-ph]].
- [17] J. Gallicchio and M. D. Schwartz, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **107** (2011) 172001 [arXiv:1106.3076 [hep-ph]].
- [18] I. Feige, M. D. Schwartz, I. W. Stewart and J. Thaler, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **109** (2012) 092001 [arXiv:1204.3898 [hep-ph]].
- [19] T. Aaltonen *et al.* [CDF Collaboration], *Phys. Rev. D* **85** (2012) 091101 [arXiv:1106.5952 [hep-ex]]; G. Aad *et al.* [ATLAS Collaboration], arXiv:1206.5369 [hep-ex].
- [20] S. Chatrchyan *et al.* [CMS Collaboration], *JHEP* **1209** (2012) 029 [arXiv:1204.2488 [hep-ex]].
- [21] M. Cacciari, G. P. Salam and G. Soyez, *JHEP* **0804** (2008) 005 [arXiv:0802.1188 [hep-ph]].
- [22] ATLAS Collaboration, ATLAS-CONF-2012-064.
- [23] M. Cacciari and G. P. Salam, *Phys. Lett. B* **659** (2008) 119 [arXiv:0707.1378 [hep-ph]].
- [24] J. Backus Mayes (for the ATLAS Collaboration), presentation at Boost 2012, Valencia, Spain.
- [25] S. Chatrchyan *et al.* [CMS Collaboration], *JINST* **6** (2011) P11002 [arXiv:1107.4277 [physics.ins-det]]; CMS Collaboration, CMS-DP-2012-012, <http://cdsweb.cern.ch/record/1460989>.
- [26] [CMS Collaboration], CMS-PAS-PFT-09-001.
- [27] S. Sapeta and Q. C. Zhang, *JHEP* **1106** (2011) 038 [arXiv:1009.1143 [hep-ph]].
- [28] R. Alon, E. Duchovni, G. Perez, A. P. Pranko and P. K. Sinervo, *Phys. Rev. D* **84** (2011) 114025 [arXiv:1101.3002 [hep-ph]].
- [29] J. Alcaraz Maestre *et al.* [SM AND NLO MULTI-LEG and SM MC Working Groups Collaboration], arXiv:1203.6803 [hep-ph].
- [30] S. Chatrchyan *et al.* [CMS Collaboration], *JHEP* **1204** (2012) 036 [arXiv:1202.1416 [hep-ex]].
- [31] M. Cacciari, P. Quiroga-Arias, G. P. Salam and G. Soyez, arXiv:1209.6086 [hep-ph].
- [32] G. P. Salam and D. Wicke, *JHEP* **0105** (2001) 061 [hep-ph/0102343].
- [33] V. Mateu, I. W. Stewart and J. Thaler, arXiv:1209.3781 [hep-ph].
- [34] C. F. Berger, T. Kucs and G. F. Sterman, *Phys. Rev. D* **68** (2003) 014012 [hep-ph/0303051].
- [35] M. L. Gonzalez Silva (for the ATLAS Collaboration), presentation at Boost 2012, Valencia, Spain.
- [36] A. Banfi, G. P. Salam and G. Zanderighi, *JHEP* **0503** (2005) 073 [hep-ph/0407286].
- [37] M. Jankowiak and A. J. Larkoski, *JHEP* **1106** (2011) 057 [arXiv:1104.1646 [hep-ph]]; *JHEP* **1204** (2012) 039 [arXiv:1201.2688 [hep-ph]].
- [38] G. Aad *et al.* [ATLAS Collaboration], arXiv:1210.4813 [hep-ex].
- [39] S. Catani, Y. L. Dokshitzer, M. H. Seymour and B. R. Webber, *Nucl. Phys. B* **406** (1993) 187.
- [40] S. D. Ellis and D. E. Soper, *Phys. Rev. D* **48**, 3160 (1993) [hep-ph/9305266].
- [41] T. Sjostrand, S. Mrenna and P. Skands, *JHEP* **0605** (2006) 026 [arXiv:hep-ph/0603175].
- [42] T. Sjostrand, S. Mrenna and P. Z. Skands, *Comput. Phys. Commun.* **178** (2008) 852 [arXiv:0710.3820 [hep-ph]].
- [43] M. Cacciari, G. P. Salam, G. Soyez, *JHEP* **0804** (2008) 063 [arXiv:0802.1189 [hep-ph]].
- [44] M. Cacciari and G. P. Salam, *Phys. Lett. B* **641** (2006) 57 [arXiv:hep-ph/0512210]; M. Cacciari, G. P. Salam and G. Soyez, arXiv:1111.6097 [hep-ph].
- [45] Y. L. Dokshitzer, G. D. Leder, S. Moretti and B. R. Webber, *JHEP* **9708**, 001 (1997) [hep-ph/9707323]; M. Wobisch and T. Wengler, arXiv:hep-ph/9907280; M. Wobisch, DESY-THESIS-2000-049.
- [46] <http://fastjet.hepforge.org/contrib>